

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ROBERT SCOTT INGRAM,

Petitioner,

v.

DONALD HOLBROOK,

Respondents.

CASE NO. C19-1981-TSZ-MAT

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR A  
MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT

Petitioner proceeds pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus matter. In response to the Court's order directing service of the amended petition, respondent filed a Motion for More Definite Statement. (Dkt. 13.) Now, having considered respondent's motion, the Court finds as follows:

(1) Respondent's Motion for a More Definite Statement (Dkt. 13) is GRANTED. The Court agrees the amended petition does not sufficiently identify specific grounds for relief, allowing for fair notice to respondent of the claims to address in an answer. Plaintiff is, accordingly, directed to submit a second amended petition. Such petition must contain a concise statement of all of the grounds for relief currently pursued by petitioner in this habeas corpus

1 proceeding.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner shall file and serve a second amended petition on or before **May 26, 2020**.  
2 Respondent shall file and serve an answer within **forty-five (45) days** after service of the second  
3 amended petition.

4 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order and of the Court's standard §  
5 2254 forms to petitioner. The Clerk is further directed to send a copy of this Order to the Honorable  
6 Thomas S. Zilly.

7 DATED this 27th day of April, 2020.

8   
9

10 Mary Alice Theiler  
United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>1</sup> Petitioner is again advised that the Court cannot grant a writ of habeas corpus unless a petitioner  
22 demonstrates that he is in custody in violation of federal law and that the highest state court decision  
23 rejecting his grounds was either "contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established  
Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a) and (d)(1).  
Petitioner must prove that his custody violates the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States. 28  
U.S.C. § 2254(a); *see also McKenzie v. McCormick*, 27 F.3d 1415, 1418-19 (9th Cir. 1994).